

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Claim Status

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 10-12, 14 and 16 are amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

Claims 4, 6-8, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. In particular, the Action asserts that the term “remote” is a relative term that has an unclear scope. In response, claims 4, 6-8, 10, 11 and 14 are amended to recite a “personal computer (PC).” The rejections under 35 USC 112 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – Ohara and Chen

Claims 4, 6-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Ohara (US 5,822,508). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Ohara in view of Chen (US 6,992,799). In response, independent claims 4, 6 and 9 are amended to clearly distinguish over Ohara and Chen.

The present invention is directed to an image processing system having a scanner 11, printer 21 and client PC 31. The system provides for scanner 11 to act as a host when scanner 11 and printer 21 are connected to each other. Similarly, PC 31 acts as a host between a PC 31 and scanner 11 connection. As disclosed in paragraph [0026] and FIG. 5, after a scanning process is executed, the scanned data is converted into a data format of the PC which can be used by printer 21 to execute PC printing (step ST33). For example, scanned data can be converted into the Postscript format for printing. Conventionally, this conversion is performed by a PC and not a scanner. Then in step ST34, the emulated data is transmitted to printer 21. In this manner, a copying operation between the scanner 11 and printer 21 can be executed by using scanned data converted into a PC data format for PC printing on printer 21, without the need for connection to a PC 31. Thus, printer 21 can receive data from the scanner 11 as if the data was formatted and sent by PC 31.

Independent claims 4, 6 and 9 are amended to emphasize the feature of data format conversion recited in dependent claim 10. For example, claim 1 is amended to recite:

...the scanner device converts a data format of the scanned data into a same format as a data format received from the PC to be forwarded to the printer device for printing...

Page 10 of the Action concedes that Ohara does not disclose a means for converting the scanned data into a same format as a data format received from a remote device to be forwarded to the printer device. However, the Action asserts that claim 1 of Chen discloses this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Chen is directed to a scanner 10 connected to either a printer 20 or a portable storage device 21. The portable storage device is merely a hard drive, floppy drive, writable optical drive, etc. and is specifically not a computer (col. 3, lines 17-18 and claim 1). The scanner 10 is connected to the portable storage device 21 that operates independently of a computer 24 in order to reduce complexity for a user (col. 1, lines 45-47). In the operation of the scanner, claim 1 of Chen recites that "the control unit converts the image data of the document according to the type of the portable storage device," and the converted image data is then transmitted to the portable storage device. Therefore, scanned data is converted into a portable storage device format suitable for storage, which is then transmitted only to the portable storage device. Even if the converted image data was sent to a printer, the storage data format would not be appropriate for printing without further conversion into a printing data format.

The present invention, by contrast, requires conversion of scanned data into a PC data format suitable for printing. Since Chen converts image data only into a data format for storage, Chen does not allow a copying operation between a scanner and printer as taught by applicant's invention and thus does not remedy the deficiencies of Ohara.

Since Ohara and Chen do not disclose each and every element of independent claims 4, 6 and 9, they cannot anticipate or render obvious those claims or claims 5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 dependent thereon. The rejections under 35 USC 102(b) and 35 USC 103(a) should therefore be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – Shih

Claims 1-3, 12, 13 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Shih (US 2003/0196011). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Ohara in view of Shih. Claim 14 is rejected as obvious over Shih in view of Chen.

In response, independent claims 1, 12 and 16 are amended in a similar manner to that of claims 4, 6 and 9, as discussed above. For example, claim 1 now recites:

...means for converting a data format of the scanned data in the scanner device into a same format as a data format received from the PC to be forwarded to the printer device for printing...

Shih is directed to a scanner that can serve as a USB host. There is no disclosure or suggestion of data format conversion, as conceded at page 11 of the Action. Therefore, Shih does not remedy the deficiencies of Ohara and Chen. Since Shih, Ohara and Chen do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 5, 12 and 16, they cannot anticipate or render obvious those claims or claims 2, 3, 13, 15 and 17-20 dependent thereon. The rejections under 35 USC 102(e) and 35 USC 103 should therefore be withdrawn.

Conclusion

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after entry of this amendment.


Appl. No. 10/772,074
Amdt. dated June 1, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 23, 2007

Atty. Ref. 81710.0265
Customer No. 26021

Any fees due with this response may be charged to our Deposit Account No.
50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: June 1, 2007

By: 
Troy M. Schmelzer
Registration No. 36,667
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: 310-785-4600
Fax: 310-785-4601